

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,497	10/08/2003		Stephen G. Bales	LA 001	5906
48373	7590	07/13/2006		EXAMINER	
STEPHEN	_	ES	DANIELS, MATTHEW J		
17 HART LANE SEWELL, NJ 08080				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1732 DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Refore the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/681,497	BALES, STEPHEN G.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Matthew J. Daniels	1732		

before the Filling of all Appear brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Matthew J. Daniels	1732					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of example 27 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 June 2006. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any replacements.	any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismis	sal of the				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further contact. 			ecause				
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8-12,14-18 and 20-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE B. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See the enclosed response to arguments.</u> 			nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
13.							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims present a change in scope that would require at least further consideration. Additionally, it is unclear how the amendments reduce or simplify the issues for appeal.

CHRISTINA JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/7/2

Application/Control Number: 10/681,497 Page 2

Art Unit: 1732

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments appear to be on the following grounds:

a) The specification and values in Claims 2 and 17 have been returned to their original values to

overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

b) Applicant has enclosed a declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 showing conception prior to July

2000 and timely reduction to practice. This declaration is believed to be in compliance with 37

CFR 1.116(e) as the Examiner raised this issue in OA Item 11.

These arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

a) Amendments drawn to returning the claimed values to those previously claimed and

considered in order to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, would be

entered if submitted by themselves. However, multiple changes in claim scope are presented in

the claims filed 21 June 2006 and this submission is not entered.

b) The issue was not raised in the final rejection mailed 5 April 2006, but was instead raised by

the rejection over Aida in view of Lloyd on page 5 of the non-final action mailed 9 August 2005.

Applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the declaration was not

earlier presented prior to the final rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Daniels whose telephone number is (571) 272-2450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJD 7/7/06

CHRISTINA JOHNSON PRIMARY EXAMINER